Special Supplement: A Plan for Peace in the Middle East

Scientists Do Not Opt For Life When They Work On New Means of Death

"Without more assurance than we now possess that this generation has a future, nothing else matters. We have got to get rid of these nuclear weapons. A balance of terror is still terror. What we are up against is the threat of this being a generation of the apocalypse. We've reached the point of great decision, not only for this generation but for life on this earth. Our government, like most governments, is obsessed with death, killing and being killed. We scientists, we opt for life."

—Nobel Prize Winner George Wald at MIT during the nationwide "research stoppage" on the nation's campuses March 4, as reported next day in the Boston Globe.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVII, NO. 6 MARCH 24, 1969 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Sorry, It's the Same Old Tricky D---y

I have often said that I felt that the first country to deploy an effective ABM system and an effective ASW [anti-submarine] system is going to control this world militarily.*

—Senator Russell, who gave instant approval to Nixon's ABM decision, speaking during last year's military appropriations hearings, as quoted by Mansfield March 7 in a speech against the ABM and its supposedly "defensive" purpose.

Mr. Nixon was too clever for his own good at his press conference of March 14. The very slickness of his performance will deepen distrust as the truth begins to trickle out. He was dishonest about the anti-ballistic missile as he was dishonest about the war in Vietnam. He has stepped into the same credibility gap where Lyndon Johnson destroyed himself. His soft sell and our hopes led us into deception. This is the same old tricky operator.

Bigger Than Sentinel

The impression he created is that he had whittled the ABM down to a minimal system which would cost $1 billion less in the coming fiscal year than Johnson's. But it turns out that his Safeguard will be bigger and cost more than Johnson's Sentinel. This came out in the briefing that same day at the Pentagon when Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard was asked (we quote p. 14 of the official transcript), "can you explain why the cost of your system is nearly a billion and a half more than the previous system yet it has possibly a half dozen complexes fewer?" Packard replied, "In order to do the job that we believe needs to be done we found it necessary to provide additional capability in the system." He explained that the new plan would require more radars and more Sprint missiles than Sentinel; "more faces on the PAR radars" and "additional PAR and that is a fairly extensive installation." "But in general," he concluded, "we are providing additional capability for the money." So the headlines, if Nixon had been frank, would have said that he had opted for a bigger, more costly system.

Why Ike Opposes The ABM

"Q: Would the $5 billion antimissile missile system recently announced by Secretary McNamara fall into the President's category of 'excessive arms?'"

"I wasn't prepared for his vivid response. Five billion! That was only the beginning, the President said impatiently. It would buy a pilot establishment, nothing else. And then we would have to go on and on until we had 'the works.' He drew a spiral in the air with his forefinger as he talked. You'd get up into the $20 billions, then the $30 billions, and the $40 billions—just for the United States. Every little town and locality would insist on having a shield. Even Gettysburg. And soon, too, all your allies will insist on having it . . . Now, mind you, the President said, I wouldn't call it a form of excessive arms if I thought it would be effective." [Emphasis in original]

—Eisenhower interview in VISTA, organ of the United Nations Association, Jan.-Feb. 1968.

The impression Nixon and Laird have conveyed is that since the Russians had deployed an ABM we had to deploy one too. But Nixon is preparing to deploy a system many times greater than the already obsolete GALOSH around Moscow. Their system, a system on which work halted some time ago, protects only the metropolitan area of Moscow. Nixon's will provide a city defense for Washington, a "thin" Spartan cover for the entire country, a thick defense for two Air Force missile bases in Montana and North Dakota, and site acquisition for Spartan and Sprint installations at nine other sites around the country (see the Pentagon chart, significantly called "Modified Sentinel" which was shown at Packard's briefing and reproduced on p. 3 of the *Washington Star*, March 15). This escalates the arms race in response to a spurious *anti*-missile gap just as Kennedy eight years ago escalated the arms race in response to a non-existent missile gap.

The dimensions of that escalation, when the full truth is known, will prove enormous. Mr. Nixon, perhaps inadvertently, let slip a figure which has hitherto been classified. He said the Russians had deployed 67 anti-missiles around Mos-

(Continued on Page Two)

*** Just what the august Georgian meant by controlling the world was not explained. In the secret Senate debate on the ABM last Oct. 14, he voted for the Sentinel program to make sure (he said) that in the event of a nuclear holocaust, any survivors would be Americans. "If we have to start over again with another Adam and Eve," Russell said, "then I want them to be Americans." The new pair would we suppose "control this world militarily", thus presumably giving posthumous satisfaction to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A New *Anti*-Arms Race—10,000 U.S. Anti-Missiles to the Soviets 67?

(Continued from Page One)

cow. How many will we deploy? The question came up at Packard's briefing—

Q. Can you tell us how many Spartan missiles and how many Sprint missiles in total would be in this?
Mr. Packard: Yes, I think so.
Mr. Fryklund (information officer): No. you can't.
Mr. Packard: No, I can't. That is classified.
Q. Can you tell us how many will be at each site?
Mr. Packard: No, we can't tell you that.

Some estimates were provided by the physicist Dr. Ralph E. Lapp March 20 at Washington State University. Dr. Lapp said the number of Spartans deployed for a "thin" area defense across the country would probably be calculated "to deal with no more than 100 attacking missiles" and the Spartans would number in the "low hundreds", i.e. perhaps two or three for each incoming missile. That will already be several times the 67 the Russians have deployed.

Just Two Minuteman Sites?

What about Sprints? Here we come to another of Mr. Nixon's deceptions. He spoke of "protecting two Minuteman sites." That sounded very minimal indeed. It turns out, as Dr. Lapp explained March 20, that the "two *sites*" are really "two Minuteman wings with a total of 35 flights." Each "flight", in Air Force parlance, is made up of ten missiles. So this is a total of 350 missiles, each in a separate silo, or 50 more than one-third of our total Minuteman force of 1,000. If Nixon had been candid, the headlines would have said that the *initial* deployment would safeguard a third of our Minutemen.

How many Sprints would be required to protect 350 Minutemen? Dr. Lapp gave a range of estimates, depending on the size and accuracy of the attacking missile. He estimated that even if the Russians achieved one-quarter of a mile accuracy (i.e. if they were able to hit within 500 yards of an object 5,000 miles away!) they would need 3 1-megaton weapons for each silo (allowing for 20% system losses and 95% kill probability). That would require 1,000 attacking missiles. The defense, in turn, would probably have to assign 3 or more Sprint missiles to each hostile object. That is a total of more than 3,000 Sprints! Our *total* Minuteman force of 1,000 would require, by that calculation, 9,000 anti-missiles to protect them. This does not count the Sprints for the city of Washington or the other sites. Let us put the grand total at 10,000 as compared with the Soviet's 67. That is raising the ante sharply, and they must be expected to reply in kind.

If you figure the missiles at a half million each, that is $5 billion. At $1 million each, it would be $10 billion. The cost figures are not only classified but not really known since production has hardly started. But this provides some idea of the business which A.T. & T.'s Western Electric, the prime contractor, and the 5,000-odd subcontroctors can expect from this, the largest procurement contract in military history.

Now we come to a natural question and another deception. Laird has said we needed an ABM as a bargaining card in the coming arms negotiations with the Soviet Union. Nixon, too, talked in his prepared statement as if this ABM program might be scaled down in future arms talks. But when the question was put to him directly, his answer—slippery as it was—indicated that the ABM was not to be abandoned, *that it was not negotiable within the limits he is already setting for the talks.* "In any talks with the Soviet Union," he was asked, "would you be willing to consider abandoning

(Continued on Page Six)

Challenge Hoover On The King Killing

"Memphis, March 15—The Memphis public defender, who was a co-counsel for James Earl Ray, said in an interview this week that he believes Ray might have had help preceding the murder of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Hugh W. Stanton, who has been the public defender of Memphis for 27 years, said he was not saying there was a conspiracy to slay the civil rights leader, 'But Ray was a dumb man, and I don't see how it can be that someone didn't help him, at least with the finances.'"

—New York Times, *March 16.*

We believe there was a conspiracy to kill Dr. King. J. Edgar Hoover, who hated and once insulted King, should be challenged to explain on what basis he announced within 24 hours of the killing that there was no conspiracy. How could he possibly have known so quickly? We believe the White House should be pressured for an investigation independent of the FBI and its chief. The only virtue of the Memphis deal is that it keeps Ray alive some day to tell the full story.

The Fantasy of Peking's Irrationality and Our Own Smug Nuclear Posture in the Far East

"I see no basis in fact or theory for attributing a significantly higher likelihood of irrationality to Chinese as compared with Russian decision-makers . . . The preponderant weight of the evidence shows that the Chinese leadership to date has used force beyond its borders with a consistently deliberate control to minimize the risks . . . The Peking leadership does not believe its vital interests include giving significant material support to foreign revolutionary movements. Mao's doctrine explicitly describes national liberation struggles as essentially dependent on local resources . . . a 'do it yourself' philosophy . . .

"If we assume a burgeoning nuclear missile program in China, we also assume the concomitant infrastructure of technological modernisation in supporting so costly and complicated a military system. This developmental process . . . increases the vulnerability of their society, no longer dependent on scattered rice-fields but now locked into the urban complex, to nuclear attack. China's acquisition of an operational nuclear missile capability should reduce, not increase, the willingness of Peking to risk nuclear war . . .

"There is one aspect of the Chinese situation, however, which is unique compared with our relationship with other nuclear powers: we did intervene and continue to intervene in the Chinese civil war. Moreover in the second Quemoy crisis of 1958, we provided the Chinese Nationalist forces with 8-inch howitzers publicly identified as capable of firing nuclear shells . . . Our nuclear deployment in the West Pacific has taken on a particular salience for Peking . . . If we continue with the ABM and its [anti-Chinese] justification we will perpetuate the suspicion . . . that we are determined to maintain maximum military superiority over China to act at will in pursuit of our interests . . .

"In this perspective the ABM is not a guarantee against Chinese irrationality or miscalculation but rather may actually be a further goad to Chinese asumptions of our malevolence and permanent enmity."

—Prof. Allen S. Whiting, Associate, Center for Chinese Studies, Univ. of Michigan testifying on the ABM, Gore subcommittee of Senate Foreign Relations March 13.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Draft Proposal for Peace in the Middle East

By Abe J. Nathan

Preamble

1. THE PROBLEM BETWEEN THE ARAB WORLD AND ISRAEL is a world problem and its constructive solution deserves immediate international attention. Because of the suspicions, tensions, and hate in the area there is a danger that any major outbreak of violence by either side may engulf the bigger powers and threaten a general war.

2. An agreed settlement between Israel and the Arab states is barred so long as the Arab states insist on complete Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied in the six day war prior to any talks, and Israel insists on direct negotiations leading to peace prior to any withdrawal. This deadlock could be overcome if and when each of the involved communities can arrive at a perspective that is mutually agreeable as a framework for negotiating the details of a settlement. This objective is important enough to deserve compromise and magnanimity from both sides.

3. Failing this there is a danger that for generations to come the peoples of the area will find themselves living under conditions of tension resulting only in increasing damage to life and property. The younger generations on both sides, even today, are growing up in a destructive environment of hate and suspicion with the result that it might be too late, as time passes, to bring about any understanding between the nations of the region. There is an ever increasing danger of activist and retaliatory incidents producing an atmosphere of greater tensions and unyielding attitude, as well as mounting loss of life and property to all sides. Any hopes of progress either on the Arab side or the Israeli side would be hampered as the resources of all concerned will have to be used mainly in acquiring weapons—a trade that would enrich only the munitions factories of the big powers.

4. There are grounds for hoping that a solution could be found among the people of Israel, the Palestinian Arabs and the Jordanians, provided that their respective integrity, sense of sovereignty, and dignity as a people could be assured and respected.

5. The framework for an agreement for a Union of Jerusalem is outlined here. This does not purport to be a complete, comprehensive plan, but only a definition of strategic aspects which needs filling out by specialists from the area. The terms of a durable peace settlement and the solution of the refugee problem are emphasized here. It is expected that the solving of problems in these areas will facilitate a basis for negotiations and the signing of peace agreements with the Arab states of the Middle East.

6. In spite of what appears to be on the surface a difficult and tragic problem with no immediate solution in sight, there is still an abundance of elements that can help bring the Arab and the Jew together, having faith that through peace and cooperation, the problems of sovereignty, integrity and identity of the peoples of the area can be maintained and strengthened. This calls for the establishment of a plan for unity between the three States of the Union as a step towards the realization of peace in the area.

7. Let the door be open to any of the countries of the Middle East that wish to participate in this unique opportunity to establish a basis for equality for all the peoples of this area.

Part I

THE UNION OF JERUSALEM

1. THERE SHALL BE A UNION between three separate, independent sovereign states and peoples, which shall be called The Union of Jerusalem.

2. The geographical limits shall be:
   (a) The boundaries of the State of Israel as it was before the six-day war;
   (b) The boundaries of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan as it is today;
   (c) The boundaries comprising the area now occupied by Israel west of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip. The area within this boundary shall be called the Palestinian State.

3. The Old City and that part of Jerusalem known as East Jerusalem shall be the Capital of the three states of the Union. It is here that the policies of unified action between the three states shall be decided.

4. Making East Jerusalem, including the Old City, the capital will justify the right of presence there to the Jordanians, the Palestinians who reside there, and the Israelis.

5. Each state shall preserve its international personality and its system of government.

6. Each citizen in the Union has the right to work and to occupy public positions in the Union administration without discrimination.

7. All citizens are equal before the law of their own state in their rights and obligations without distinction of race, origin, language, religion, or creed.

About The Author and His Plan

Abe J. Nathan, the author of this plan for peace in the Middle East, has had an extraordinary career. He is a Jew of Persian origin. He was born in Abadan, Iran, on April 29, 1927. His family emigrated to India, as have so many so-called "Parsee" Jews in past centuries. There he was educated in a Jesuit school in Bombay. In World War II, he was a pilot in the Indian Royal Air Force. In 1948 he went to Palestine where he flew as a bomber-transport pilot in the Arab-Jewish war of 1948 when Israel was established. He became an Israeli citizen and thereafter for eight years was a Captain in El Al, Israel's airline. Since that time he has operated an art gallery and restaurant in Tel Aviv.

On two occasions, Nathan flew one-man "peace" missions to Egypt in an unsuccessful effort to see Nasser, once on Feb. 28, 1966 and again on July 28, 1967, landing at Port Said. On his return to Israel from this second attempt, he was tried and convicted for illegal flight and served several months in the prison at Ramallah. Since his release he has spearheaded special rescue missions for Biafran relief in Israel, Western Europe and the United States.

His peace plan, published here for the first time in full in the English language, appeared originally in Hebrew in Maariv, a Tel Aviv evening paper which has we believe the largest circulation of any paper in Israel. It was to be printed in Arabic during the week of March 17 in al-Quds (the Holy City), the Arabic newspaper published in Jerusalem, which has been allowed wide freedom by the Israeli authorities.

We believe the Nathan plan offers a way out of a stale and hateful situation, with justice to both Arab and Jewish national aspirations and with recompense and a new start for the Palestinian Arabs uprooted in the 1948, 1956, and 1967 wars.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Part II

ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNION

8. THE ADMINISTRATION OF UNION affairs shall be assumed by a council named the Union Council. It shall be composed of the Heads of the member states.

9. The Chairmanship of the Council shall be assumed alternatively by the head of each member state for a period that will be decided upon by the Union Council.

10. The Union Council shall include an equal number of representatives from the three states, and their duration of membership and their functions will be decided upon by the Union Council.

11. The decisions of the Union Council must be unanimous.

12. The budget of the Union administration will be decided upon by the Union Council. This budget will be substantiated by contributions of each member state.

13. The Union Council will define the policies of the Union with regard to economic, defense, political and cultural problems.

Part III

ADMINISTRATION OF THE CAPITAL

14. THE CAPITAL SHALL BE ADMINISTERED by a council whose heads will be representatives of the three States.

15. A council of Religious Affairs comprised of Jewish, Muslim, and Christian representatives, in charge of their respective religious institutions and holy places, will act as a special department of the administration.

16. The internal administration of the capital shall be conducted by the people of the area.

17. Only citizens of the Union may be permanent residents of the capital.

18. Only citizens of the Union may be entitled to own land and/or property within the limits of the capital.

19. Residents will pay taxes to their respective governments.

20. The administrative costs of the capital will be paid out of the municipal council budget.

21. Close cooperation will be established with the City of Jerusalem with respect to sanitation, water, postal and police facilities.

22. Only permanent residents of the capital may be entitled to hold office in or be involved with the running of the administration of the capital.

23. Permanent residents are entitled to vote and/or run for office in those governments in which they hold citizenship.

24. The construction and upkeep of all buildings used for the administration will be planned by the council and paid for jointly by the three states.

25. No punishment may be imposed on any citizen except by virtue of the law of the country where the crime was committed.

Part IV

GOVERNING BODIES OF THE UNION

26. THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENTS will be responsible to the Union Council and all their decisions must be submitted for ratification by the Union Council:

Economic Department

27. Developmental and economic stability in the Union must ensure the freedom of travel and trade without any barriers to all citizens who will have the joint use for trade of all airports, highways and seaports in the Union.

28. The economic development of the Palestinian State will be accelerated by the execution of the refugee rehabilitation plan, outlined in Articles 55-64.

29. Each State will prepare five-year economic plans that will modernize and develop the agricultural and industrial output of the three States. These plans must be submitted to the Union Council for ratification. The ultimate goal of these plans shall be equal levels of industrial and agricultural developments and standards of living in all parts of the Union.

30. No citizen, firm, or other organization of one State may purchase or otherwise acquire title to land in another State of the Union. Cooperation in taxation systems, as a result of inter-State trade and other spheres of mutual economic problems shall be facilitated by Joint Boards of experts in which each State will be adequately represented.

31. A special committee appointed by the Union Council will draw up plans to deal with problems created by the presence of the various currencies in the member States. This committee would also prepare a program for custom clearance between the member States.

32. The Economic Department will also draw up plans for the joint exploration of natural resources and development of trade between the member States and abroad.

33. All major programs of the Economic Department must seek ratification by the Union Council.

34. The Economic Department will be headed by an equal number of representatives from each member State and will be appointed to the Department by their respective States.

Defense Department

35. The Union Council will coordinate external defense for the Union.

36. There will be two army commands, one headed by the Jordanian Chief of Staff and the other by the Israeli Chief of Staff. A joint administration headquarters will be located at the Union capital. Their function is to plan and insure the security of the Union from outside aggression.

37. The separate armies would be maintained and paid for by their respective States unless decided otherwise by joint agreement.

38. No army would enter territory of another State unless requested by the respective government, and is unanimously approved by the Union Council.

39. The area comprising the Palestinian State will not maintain an army even though Palestinian citizens may volunteer or be recruited into either Jordanian or Israeli armed forces. The Palestinian State would, however, have its own police force for the maintenance of law and order within the State and will be paid for by and be responsible to the Palestinian government. More detailed plans of cooperation could be worked out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in consultation with the Union Council.

40. The Union Council will be advised by the Chiefs of Staff on matters of defense in order to ensure the security and safety of the member states in the Union. The policy to be followed concerning general mobilization and civil defense in time of war will be outlined by the Union Council.

Political Department

41. The Political Department shall be composed of representatives of the three member States.

42. All plans and decisions must receive ratification from the Union Council.

43. All international treaties and pacts that each of the member States had signed before the establishment of the Union will remain valid with respect to the State which signed them without binding any of the other member States. However, all treaties entered into by one or more member

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States after the establishment of the Union must be ratified by the Union Council.

44. Complete and separate sovereignty in each of the separate States must be guaranteed to enable the function of sepate administration.

45. Political interference in the internal political affairs of the separate governments by other States in the Union shall be prohibited.

46. The foreign policies of member States shall be coordinated by the Union Council.

47. A system for diplomatic and consular representation of the Union abroad shall be decided upon by the Union Council, be it separate or unified. [Each member State may maintain a separate diplomatic establishment, but any member shall be free to combine representation with one or more member States of the Union].

Cultural Department

48. The Cultural Department shall be composed of representatives of each of the three member States.

49. Each member State will be the author of its own cultural program, in pursuance of its own historic and cultural identity. The official languages of the Union shall be Arabic, Hebrew, and English.

50. This department shall be responsible for preparing a general education policy and for outlining educational programs that will encourage the maintenance of each State's cultural identity.

51. This department will prepare a unified program for technical and vocational education in the three member States of the Union.

52. The Cultural Department will be responsible to the Union Council and will coordinate the efforts of various cultural organizations in the member States. After an interim period, plans should be drawn by the representative of the three States to have all education, health and social service expenditures to be based on a fixed per capita rate—that is, equal money will be allocated to educating the children of Israel, Palestine, and Jordan.

53. In all schools throughout the Union the study of Hebrew, Arabic, and English will be compulsory, and the studies of Arab and Jewish history will be encouraged.

54. This Department will be responsible for formulating a system for free exchange of professors, teachers, and students between schools and universities of the member States of the Union.

Part V

THE REFUGEE PLAN

55. No Solution to the Middle East Problem is possible without solving the problem of rehabilitation of and compensation to the refugees from military and political hazards since 1948.

56. Firstly, the State of Israel, with assistance from other governments, shall create a Refugee Fund of four hundred million dollars. This sum exceeds, with interest, over the past twenty years, the total value of all the land and property of the Arab refugees who either left or fled from the territory of the State of Israel during the 1948 war.

57. The fund shall be utilized to pay compensation to those who seek compensation and/or shall be invested for general economic development in the Palestinian State, for homes, hospitals, schools, roads, and local industries.

58. The creation of a Peace Corps can play a vital part in the rehabilitation of the refugees. A two thousand man Peace Corps of Jews and Arabs shall be created to implement the program.

59. The Peace Corps will help in the hospitals, schools, and farms and with the general resettlement of refugees anywhere within the Union.

60. The members of the Peace Corps may consist of those conscripted Israelis who are serving in the Israeli army, or they may include recruits from the Jordanian army. One year out of the total compulsory military service will be devoted entirely to the Peace Corps.

61. Citizens of the Union may also volunteer to serve in the Peace Corps.

62. The Peace Corps will be paid entirely by the State of Israel.

63. The right of the Palestinian Arab to reacquire his home or land could be planned in the following manner.

A) When an Arab citizen puts claim to a house that he owned before May 15th, 1948, and the house still exists, he shall remain the owner of the house and be entitled to receive all the rent collected by the Israeli Custodian of Arab Property over the past twenty years. While he remains the owner he may not have the right to evict the tenant of the same house as long as the rent is being paid.

B) In the case of an Arab who owned a house before May 15th, 1948, and that house does not exist anymore as a house, then financial compensation must be paid, taking into account the value of that same property and the interest thereof, in the past twenty years.

C) In the case of an Arab who owned land before May 15, 1948, then if this land has been plowed, or been worked on, or houses have been built on it, then he would be compensated financially as in the previous section. If an Arab owned land before May 15th, 1948, and this land has not been either plowed, irrigated or worked on, then unless this particular land is considered as territory essential to the security of the State, this land must be returned to his custody. Any Arab so returning to his land in Israel will be subject to the laws of Israel.

64. Similar principle shall apply to Jews and others who before May 15th, 1948, fled from land, homes, or properties in the territory occupied by Jordan after 1948.

Part VI

65. It Is Hoped that the above proposal will satisfy the demands and establish the integrity, sovereignty and the identity of Israel, the People of Palestine and the State of Jordan. In addition to the above proposal, it must be necessary to make the following recommendations that may help in setting up peace negotiations with the rest of the Arab world.

66. A) Demilitarization of the Sinai after Israeli withdrawal.

B) Freedom of passage to all shipping in the Suez Canal and Straits of Tiran guaranteed by the Four Powers (U.S.A., U.S.S.R., etc.)

C) With respect to the Golan Heights, Israel will maintain those positions along the Heights considered strategic for the maintenance of her security but will not exploit or use the land for gain or profit. Any modifications of this status quo will be made only with the joint agreement of the governments of Israel and Syria.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why A First Strike Would Be Sure Suicide for Russia or China

(Continued from Page Two)

the ABM program altogether if the Soviets showed a similar willingness or indeed, if they showed a readiness to place limitations on offensive weapons?" Mr. Nixon replied that while he was ready to consider both offensive and defensive weapons, "the arms talks, that at least preliminarily have been discussed, *do not involved limitations or reductions.* [Our emphasis] They involve only freezing where we are." If "where we are" includes this ABM and the MIRVs and the rest of the huge expansion we have in the works, what is there to negotiate?

In the light of this reply, the ABM is not a bargaining card at all but an attempt to commit the country to an ABM system in advance of talks. "The abandoning of the entire system," Mr. Nixon went on to say, "particularly as long as the Chinese threat is there, I think neither country would look upon with much favor." If the ABM is to go on "as long as the Chinese threat is there" then it will go on for a long time indeed. For our military, the mere existence of China is a threat. Mr. Nixon went on to make another tricky assertion. Mr. Nixon said the Soviet ABM had been deployed originally against the U.S. but "today their radars, from our intelligence, are also directed toward Communist China." When Senator Gore opened his hearings on the ABM March 6 he said that some officials had declared that the Soviet ABM was aimed at China as well as the U.S. but "this statement flatly contradicts what the Foreign Relations Committee was told by another equally responsible source just a few days ago." That witness, it has since leaked out, was none other than Richard Helms, head of the CIA.

They Can't Be That Crazy

These are only a few of the strands in this thick woven web of deception. Let us take another. If the Chinese threat is the essential factor, as the words we have just quoted indicate, then why is Nixon putting his first ABMs around the Minuteman instead of the cities? The Chinese would have to be twice as crazy as our Joint Chiefs of Staff would like us to think they are to justify that deployment. The latest estimates are that they may have 18 or 20 ICBMs in a few years. It would be insane for them to attack the U.S., which can deliver 4200 warheads, with their puny 18 or 20. They would have to be many times crazier to use their handful against our 1,000 Minutemen. China's puny handful have only one possible military significance. Our military wants an ABM against them so it can threaten, or make, a first strike against China without fear of retaliation. That handful might be used in one last dying attempt to hit back at some American city. If these military lunatics of ours are thinking of a Chinese attack, the only attack remotely conceivable would be a retaliatory attempt against one or two of our cities if we were destroying China in a first strike. (Even this is highly improbable because our first target would be their missiles). To safeguard against such a contingency a city defense is needed. But Mr. Nixon now says no city defense is possible. So how does his ABM protect us from China?

The contradictions are as great if the real enemy is the Soviet Union. At one point in his press conference Mr. Nixon said, quite correctly, of the Russians, "They have always thought in defensive terms, and if you read not only their political leaders, but their military leaders, the emphasis is on defense." If they think in terms of defense, why make our plans on the assumption that they might make a first strike? An attempt at a first strike would be as certain suicide for them as it would be for the Chinese. Do we think the Russians, too, are irrational? Mr. Nixon said we had to deploy ABM's around our Minutemen to make our "deterrent capability credible." He talked as if we had no other deterrent but these land-based ICBMs. But what of our Polaris submarines, on which billions have been spent, to give us an invulnerable second strike capacity? Even if an enemy could wipe out every U.S. ICBM in one swift blow, it would face certain destruction from these submarines, always on the prowl, hidden in the seas and much closer to the borders of the Soviet Union.

We can deliver 4200 warheads averaging 1 megaton each, more than four times their total capacity. Our land-based missiles can deliver 1700. Our Polaris submarines can deliver 656. Our third deterrent force, the Strategic Air Command, can deliver the rest, about 1800 warheads. These are the officially published U.S. figures.*

(Continued on Page Seven)

* **For a fuller account of our stupendous destructive power power see my article "Nixon and The Arms Race: How Much Is Sufficiency?" in the** New York Review of Books **for March 27, written before Nixon's decision to go ahead with the ABM.**

Mustn't Let Our Heroes Get Bored

ABOARD USS NEW JERSEY, Off South Vietnam—Crew members of the Battleship New Jersey do not think in terms of "retaliatory strikes" but almost all of them seem anxious for an excuse to resume the shelling of North Vietnam. The reason, as several of them explained, is that lobbing 16-inch shells into targets in South Vietnam is just too boring in comparison with the adventurous uncertainty of duty off North Vietnam. "Here we're doing as much damage," said fire control technician Robert Troxel, a mustached, bespectacled 20-year old who pulls the brass triggers that fire the 16-inchers, "but it doesn't seem glorious." . . . The ship's 16-inch shells weigh nearly a ton apiece and can be fired on targets 20 miles away.

—Donald Kirk in the Washington Star, *March 9*

The Truth Nixon Tried To Distort About The War In Vietnam

Mr. Nixon was as tricky on the war in Vietnam as he was on the ABM at his March 14 press conference. When asked whether we had not stepped up the war, he said we had "no other choice but to try to blunt the offensive!" The Washington Post found this too much to swallow. "The President," it said in an editorial next day, "might have enlarged the citizens' understanding of the realities of the war if he had admitted that the Americans have been on the offensive for the past six months." While the other side withdrew troops after the bombing halt Oct. 31, battalion-sized attacks from our side rose from 727 in November to 956 in December to 1,077 in January, an increase of almost 48% in two months. The figures on battalion-sized attacks from the other side are classified, to hide the realities from the U.S. public. The fact is that there was only one battalion-sized attack in each of those three months from the other side. The enemy offensive is a reaction to ours, not—as Nixon implied—the other way around.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The ABM Would Prove to Be A Whole Series of Electronic Maginot Lines

(Continued from Page Six)

If an enemy destroyed two of these deterrents, he would still face destruction at the hands of the third. If only 100 of our 4200 warheads survived a first attack, that would be enough (according to McNamara's final posture statement last year) to destroy 59% of Soviet industry and 37 million people in one swift counter-blow. That is half again as many Soviet people who died in World War II, and it does not include those who would die after the first 24 hours from wounds, radiation, hunger and despair in the atomic ruins. The idea that the defense-minded Russians would try a first strike against such odds is a nightmare dreamed up by the Strangeloves of the military-industrial complex to create a market for its fantastic wares. Mr. Nixon has used the highest office in the land to support their preposterous and enormously expensive nonsense.

The Keys To All This Nonsense

To understand the folly of the ABM one need only keep in mind five general propositions. The first is that in the game of nuclear "cops and robbers" the offense can think up an endless number of relatively inexpensive gimmicks—from penetration aids and MIRVs and changes in trajectory—each of which forces the defense into complex and costly counter-measures. The ABM defense is like a whole series of Maginot Lines, each of which can easily be outflanked and rendered useless. The second is that the offense can concentrate its forces while the defense must spread itself thin. An enemy can concentrate all his missiles on one or two cities for a retaliatory blow. The ABM defense has to have enough protection for *every* city and *every* major industrial and military area sufficiently large to match any such concentration of forces. If an enemy only has 10 missiles we have to put three times as many anti-missiles at *every* point we have to defend. The odds are with the attacker. If one warhead gets through, that is the end of the area defended. The attacker only needs one more missile to overwhelm the defense in this game of one-upmanship.

The third proposition is that, contrary to Mr. Nixon, it is more, not less, difficult to defend Minuteman bases than it is to defend cities. The firing of our ABMs would, as Dr. Lapp explained in a speech at Kansas State University March 12, foul up the electronic circuitry of the computers and guidance controls on which Minuteman depends. We may "black-out" our own missile forces and computers in the effort to defend them. The fourth proposition is that if we saw a first strike coming—and a first strike would be a mass of weapons—we would hardly leave our Minutemen in their silos to wait and see how our ABMs would work. We would fire them off at the enemy in the 15 or 20 minutes of warning time that would allow. The enemy would only hit empty holes and we would only be defending empty holes. The fifth and final proposition is that we still do not know how much damage these defenses would do to ourselves. The Spartans could blind hundreds of thousands of our own people in the area defended. The Sprints would create harmful blast and radiation effects if they hit the

(Continued on Page Eight)

Psychological Byproducts of the ABM

". . . Deployment of the ABM provides a continuing urgent demand for a larger share of U.S. resources by the military-industrial complex . . . Since these demands also subtract resources from domestic programs —many of which are frequently looked upon with disfavor as being 'socialistic' in their effect, at least by some ABM supporters—ABM spending has a double value . . . Deployment of an ABM system encourages continuing anxiety by citizens about possible nuclear attack, a factor helpful in maintaining the kind of cold war attitudes so profitable to the military-industrial-political complex. Such anxiety inhibits any possible major shift in policies leading to more peaceful coexistence . . . The real purpose of the ABM, thin or thick, is to extend for a few more years the illusion of the generals and their friends that the power of the Pentagon can enforce U.S. policies around the world."

—Brown (D. Cal) in the House March 13, one of the best speeches made in Congress on the ABM.

Scientist Explains How Sentinel Is More Likely to Foul Up Than Protect ICBM Bases

"Should the U.S. deploy interceptory missiles to protect Minuteman sites these would be concentrated in six geographical areas with a total area of some 50,000 square miles. The deployment of missiles to defend such a limited area raises some critical questions about the feasibility of ABM systems for hard point defense . . .

"The use of ABM systems to protect Minuteman sites could prove hostile to effective launching of Minuteman missiles. If Spartans are used for high altitude intercepts the U.S. may generate its own black-out. But apart from radar effects one must consider radiation-induction effects from nuclear bursts. I have in mind phenomena of the EMP (electromagnetic pulse) type in which high frequency oscillations are produced by asymmetric behavior of the nuclear burst. These oscillations can induce excessive currents in electronic circuitry, especially in such devices as computers and guidance controls aboard Minuteman missiles. An ICBM is much more vulnerable to nuclear weapon effects during its boost phase than the ICBM warhead during its reentry phase. I find it difficult to believe that the U.S. Air Force is enthusiastic about the use of Army missiles to defend Minuteman sites.

"Too often the problem of ABM interception of an ICBM warhead is pictured as a single event in which one ABM strikes at a single warhead. If we try to visualize a first strike at Minuteman sites we must picture it as a multitude of hostile warheads compressed in rather constricted threat corridors and compressed in a time band of a few minutes at most . . .

"While proponents of ABM defense of ICBM bases have not indicated deployment plans these would be evident to the Soviet Union by orbital inspection. Thus the Soviets would know whether only part of the Minuteman force is to be heavily defended with many Sprints or the whole six complexes are to be defended.

"The time-space concentration of a first strike attack on ICBM bases would necessitate high-density Sprint defense in which interceptors would be vectored to hostile warheads by sophisticated radars. It is doubtful if Sentinel type radar facilities could handle the traffic and discrimination problems of a massive attack."

—Dr. Ralph E. Lapp at Kansas State U., March 12.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Real—and Sinister—Meaning of Laird's "Strategy Gap"

(Continued from Page Seven)

oncoming missiles below a certain level, let us say 10 miles. In a nuclear bombardment, offense and defense would mingle and the defense might only stoke the fires of the very hell the offense had ignited.

The Dream Of A Safe First Strike

In deciding to go ahead with the ABM Mr. Nixon has entered the country in a nuclear rat race which must prove ever more expensive as we seek constantly to "improve" it in response to enemy counter-measures. Mr. Nixon tried to give the impression that these measures were purely defensive. But the Russians have said all along that their ABMs around Moscow are purely defensive too; a system around their capital is certainly not a preparation for a first strike. Yet we are responding with this huge ABM program on the ground that our deterrent is threatened by the Moscow ABM and by the buildup in the number of Russion ICBMs which is their response to our decision in September 1967 to deploy Sentinel. Mr. Nixon spoke as if his ABM system was tentative. So it is but only in the sense that the Pentagon knows it is inadequate. "Each phase of the deployment," Mr. Nixon said in his prepared statement on March 14, "will be reviewed to insure that we are doing as much as necessary" and to "take maximum advantage of the information gathered from the initial deployment in designing the later phases of the program." This signals annual expansion and "improvement." There is no end to the billions this monstrous folly can eat up. Its worst aspect is that our military, as the Russell remark we quoted at the beginning of this article shows, still dream of a perfect missile defense. This would enable them to threaten a first strike with impunity and thus dictate to the world. This is what Laird was hoping for when he wrote of a "strategy gap."

We have only scratched the surface of the tricky presentation by Mr. Nixon and Defense Secretary Packard. The latter turns out to be another devious character out of the electronics business in which he made his $300,000,000 fortune; his liberal sentiments on arms reduction and social welfare turn out to be eyewash. But we have shown enough to enable the reader to understand why Eisenhower and Kennedy declined to approve the ABM and why *every* science adviser of Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson has consistently opposed it. It must be defeated or it will set off a major new spiral in the arms race and divert to the military and the arms industry not only the money but the technological ingenuity so desperately needed at home. It can be defeated if the Senate opposition holds firm and exposes the whole imposture as the Gore subcommittee of Senate Foreign Relations has begun to do. The leaders of the fight against the ABM, Cooper and Fulbright, Mansfield and Kennedy, must call halt before it is too late. The peace movement must mobilize as never before to counteract the contractor and military lobbyists for this billion dollar boondoggle now swarming into almost every office on Capitol Hill. Not the least of the matters at stake is the future of our best youth. How end alienation from democratic processes and peaceful change when they see a President opt for such terrible waste against near unanimous scientific advice and in the face of social needs so urgent they threaten the future of our society?

The Truth From An ABM Contractor

"Skepticism about whether the Sentinel would work as designed is so widespread that even some of the contractors are asking that the ABM not be deployed at this time. A scientist for a company which presently has such contracts with the Department of Defense was in my office the other day and said he had been authorized by his employer to come to Capitol Hill and tell Members of Congress that the Sentinel, in its current state of development, would not work and should not be deployed. Delay in deployment would cost this company hundreds of thousands of dollars . . . I am not authorized to divulge the name of this contractor because they fear reprisal in the form of lost contracts on other projects."

—Cook (Ky) in the Senate March 12, one of the four GOP Senate freshman against the ABM.

We'll Be Glad to Send A Free Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, **In A Time of Torment** (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly 3/24/69

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED